1 2 3 4 5 6 7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 WILLIAM KING, 11 Plaintiff, No. CIV S-03-2672 LKK JFM P 12 VS. 13 JAMES NIELSEN, Defendants. 14 **ORDER** 15 Plaintiff, an individual serving a civil commitment term at Atascadero State 16 17 Hospital proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, sought relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 18 Judgment was entered in this action on September 13, 2005. On September 26, 2005, plaintiff 19 filed a notice of appeal and a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal. 20 The Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure provide as follows: 21 [A] party who has been permitted to proceed in an action in the district court in forma pauperis . . . may proceed on appeal in forma pauperis without further authorization unless . . . the district court 22 shall certify that the appeal is not taken in good faith or shall find 23 that the party is otherwise not entitled so to proceed . . . . 24 Fed. R. App. P. 24(a). This court has not certified that plaintiff's appeal is not taken in good 25 faith and has not otherwise found that plaintiff is not entitled to proceed on appeal in forma 26 /////

## Case 2:03-cv-02672-LKK-JFM Document 49 Filed 01/13/06 Page 2 of 2

1	pauperis. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal will
2	be denied as unnecessary.
3	In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's
4	September 26, 2005 motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is denied as unnecessary.
5	See Fed. R. App. P. 24(a).
6	DATED: January 12, 2006.
7	
8	/s/Lawrence K. Karlton UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9	/king2672.24gf
10	Allig2072.2 Igi
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22   23	
24	
25	
26	